



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,470	09/27/2006	Joel Zychick	1047-031	1309
34060	7590	05/20/2010	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL N. HAYNES 1341 HUNTERSFIELD CLOSE KESWICK, VA 22947			SASTRI, SATYA B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			1796	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
			05/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,470	ZYCHICK ET AL.	
	Examiner SATYA B. SASTRI	Art Unit 1796	

All Participants:

(1) SATYA B. SASTRI.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Michael Haynes.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 May 2010

Time: 1:15pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 18, 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Satya B Sastri/
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney was contacted to discuss the amendment dated 5/11/10. It was noted that claim 21 indicated as being allowable in the previous office action depended on claim 18. However, the present amendment raises 112 issues in that there is no support for including a soybean protein composition in the polymer composition as recited in claims 1 and 18. Additionally, the wt. percent recited for the multifunctional monomer and the processing aid, with the polyethoxy monomer contributing up to the balance of the dry polymer composition, does not take into account the soybean protein composition present therein (in amended claims 1 and 18). Possible amendment of claim 18, changing the dependency of claims 2-17 to depend on claim 18 and amendment of method claim 23 to include the limitations of claim 18 were discussed. Applicant's attorney was given a reasonable amount of time (24h) to consult with the client.